

REMARKS

Traverse

The Examiner states that the application contains claims directed to patentably distinct species. The Examiner states that the claims form two distinct species because "species II does not recite . . . necessitating the need to induce a vacuum pressure." This is simply wrong. Claim 12 in line 4, unambiguously recites ". . . inducing a vacuum pressure . . ." The Applicant understands that restrictions are the *Rejection de Jure* at the USPTO, but is nevertheless simply perplexed at the grounds for the present rejection. Withdrawal of the restriction is respectfully requested.

Additionally, because the Applicant is electing species II, below, which is a method applicable to all drawings, there is no limitation required to be made to a species as shown in a drawing. Further, no additional search burden is placed on the Examiner.

Election

In the event the Examiner finds the above unpersuasive, the Applicant elects species II, claims 12 - 18.

If the Examiner has any other matters which remain, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the under signed attorney to resolve these matters by Examiners Amendment where possible.

Respectfully Submitted,



Steven W. Thrasher

Reg. No. 43,192

Attorney for Applicant

Thrasher Associates, LLC
391 Sandhill Dr., Suite 1600
Richardson, Texas 75080
Tel: (972) 918-9312
Fax: (972) 231-2686